UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/650,082	08/28/2003	Udo Klein	15609-017001 / 2003P00621	7222

32864   7590   05/12/2008
FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C.
PO BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER
ROBINSON, GRETA LEE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2168	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/12/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>13 March 2008</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>9-20</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on March

13, 2008 has been entered.

2.   Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 9-20 has status withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of
> making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the
> art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall
> set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4.   Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply

with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which

was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one

skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had

possession of the claimed invention. Regarding claim 1 the following limitation does not

appear to be described in the disclosure: "common relationship" [see claim 1 lines 4-5].

Claims 2-8 are rejected based on dependency.

5.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6.   Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 1, the following limitation is vague: "common relationship" [see:

claim 1 lines 4-5]. Claims 2-8 are rejected based on dependency.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of

the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g)

prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8.   Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Mukundan et al. US Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0177587 A1 in view of

Gusack US Patent 6,112,209.

Regarding claim 1, **Mukundan et al.** teaches a computer-implemented method

comprising: selecting a first data record stored at a first level of a data model, the first

data record being connected to other first-level data by way of central data stored at a

second level of the data model, each of the first data record and the other first-level data

having a common relationship to the central data [note: page 5 paragraph 0090 *data*

model which serves as the basis for various applications ; page 25 paragraph 0762 At

block 3630, in response to the user's selection of the respective command item, the command

associated with the respective item is routed to an appropriate destination for processing;

Figure 36 note steps 3620 through 3640; also note abstract "a method is provided in which

a **first field** and a **second field** of a data record are displayed to a user using a client program,

the second field having one or more attributes that are dependent upon the value of the first

field. In response to a detection that the first field has changed, the value of the first field is sent

to a server program. The server program is configured to process the changed value of the first

field and determine corresponding changes with respect to the one or more attributes of the

second field"];

associating the first data record with a grouping value that is generated based on

a pre-determined grouping reason [note: page 25 paragraph 0762; Figure 36 steps

3620 through 3640; command objects may be defined page 25 paragraph 0763];

selecting a second data record stored at the first level [note: paragraph 0762 and

0189; Figure 37 step 3760; Figures 20, 21, 38 and 39]; and

associating the second data record with the grouping value, such that a

modification of the first data record will result in a synchronizing modification of the

second data record but not of a record having the common relationship to the central

data is not associated with the grouping value [note: "a method is provided in which a first

field and a second field of a data record are displayed to a user using a client program, the

second field having one or more attributes that are dependent upon the value of the first field. In

response to a detection that the first field has changed, the value of the first field is sent to a

server program. The server program is configured to process the changed value of the first field

and determine corresponding changes with respect to the one or more attributes of the second

field" abstract; Figures 37-39 and 41; *logical grouping or mapping may be defined* see

paragraph 0765]. Although Mukundan et al. teaches the invention substantially, they do

not explicitly teach a grouping value. Mukundan et al. teaches logical grouping or

mappings may be defined to associate identified fields for changes [paragraph 0091].

Gusack teaches a linking value (i.e. grouping value) [see: abstract "The linking values

stored in the central linking table indexes may be predefined to automatically structure and link

a plurality of unspecified data changes in the data may alter the linking structure to provide

further capabilities"; column 1 lines 1-10; column 3 lines 54-58; column 23 lines 33-55

linking value]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the

invention to have combined Gusack with Mukundan et al. because a linking value or

grouping value would enable contents of the first field to be dynamically linked and

synchronized with the contents of the second field when modified.

9.   Regarding claims 2-4:

(claim 2) "wherein the group value is time-dependent" [see: Mukundan et al.

page 20 paragraph 0677 a design-time menu activation/suppression feature is provided

for applet-level menu ; also note Gusack col. 10 lines 41-59 changes are automatic;

Figure 21];

(claim 3) "determining that the group value has changed from a first grouping

value to a second grouping value with respect to the first data record; and

re-assessing synchronization of the first data record and second data

record based on the second grouping value" [note: Gusack col. 9 lines 21-36];

(claim 4) "wherein re-assessing synchronization of the first data record and

second data record based on the second grouping value comprises:

determining that the second data record continues to be associated with

the first grouping value;

splitting the first data record into a first portion and a second portion that

are associated with the first grouping value and the second grouping value,

respectively; and

modifying content of the second portion to reflect association with the

second grouping value" [note: Gusack col. 10 lines 41-59 changes are automatic;

Figure 21 note software procedure].

10.   Regarding claim 5, wherein associating the first data record with the grouping

value comprises:

examining contents of pre-designed record of a set of data records of which the

first data record is a part; and

generating the grouping value based on the contents [note: Mukundan et al

paragraph 0091 logical groupings of various types may be implemented, paragraph

0097 and 0109-0111; and column 3 lines 54-58; column 23 lines 33-55].

11.   Regarding claim 6, wherein the first data record and the second data record are

time-dependent and time-constrained [note: Mukundan et al. page 20 paragraph 0677 a

design-time menu activation/suppression feature is provided for applet-level menu;

Figure 19].

12.   Regarding claims 7 and 8:

(claim 7) "wherein the central data includes data related to a single person [note:

Mukundan et al. paragraph 0071];

(claim 8) "wherein the first data record relates to a first work assignment of the

person, and the second record relates to a second work assignment of the person"

[note: Mukundan et al. paragraphs 0068-0070 and 0063; paragraph 0099 through 0103

assignment of tasks through assignment Manager].

Response to Arguments

13.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8 have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

In the response Applicant argued the following:

ARGUMENT: Neither Mukundan nor Gusack suggest a associating two data records

with a grouping value that is generated based on a predetermined grouping reason,

such that modification of a first record will result in synchronization modification of a

second record.

RESPONSE: The Examiner respectfully maintains the rejection. Mukundan teaches "a

method, apparatus, and system for immediate posting of changes in a client server

environment" see paragraph 0001. Changes are implemented in real time through

synchronization processes which include blocking ability see paragraphs 0068 and

0120. Muklundan et al. provides for the limitation of a data model see paragraphs 0063

"The data storages services 170 provide the data storage for the data model". At page 25

paragraph 0762 *selection and associating provisions* as follows: "At block 3630, in

response to the user's selection of the respective command item, the command associated with

the respective item is routed to an appropriate destination for processing"; Figure 36 note

steps 3620 through 3640; also note abstract "a method is provided in which a first field and

a second field of a data record are displayed to a user using a client program, the second field

having one or more attributes that are dependent upon the value of the first field. In response to

a detection that the first field has changed, the value of the first field is sent to a server program.

The server program is configured to process the changed value of the first field and determine

corresponding changes with respect to the one or more attributes of the second field". At

paragraph 0763 note "user interface item object is associated to a corresponding object."

Mukundan et al. does not specifically provide for the limitation of a grouping value;

however they do teach logical grouping or mapping may be defined to associate

identified fields for changes [see: paragraph 0091]. Gusack teaches a linking value or

grouping value [see: abstract "The linking values stored in the central linking table indexes

may be predefined to automatically structure and link a plurality of unspecified data changes in

the data may alter the linking structure to provide further capabilities"; column 1 lines 1-10;

column 3 lines 54-58; column 23 lines 33-55 linking value]. The motivation to combine

the cited references is that a linking value or grouping value would enable contents of

the first field to be dynamically linked and synchronized with the contents of the second

field when modified. Note Mukundan provides for synchronization modification [see:

paragraphs 0067-0068, 0078 and 0083].

Conclusion

14.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Greta L. Robinson whose telephone number is

(571)272-4118. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30AM-6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Tim T. Vo can be reached on (571)272-3642. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Greta L. Robinson/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2168
March 07, 2008